

REMARKS

Claims 1-129 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-129 stand rejected.

Claims 2, 49, 50, 102, 104 and 114 have been objected to.

Claim Objections

Claim 2 has been amended to properly recite “provided by each source application”.

Claim 50 has been amended to properly recite “by the source application”.

Claim 102 has been amended to recite “in response to”.

Claim 114 has been amended to recite “in response to”.

Correct claim status indicators have been provided.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 48, 50-81, 96, 103, 105-109, and 119-128 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 for being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 50, 96, 105, and 119 have been amended to include a “program memory” and “a processor for reading and executing the instructions contained in the program memory”. Thus, claims 50, 96, 105, and 119 and claims dependent thereon are not directed to software only.

Claim 80 has been amended to recite “a processor; and a program memory, coupled to the processor, that includes processor readable instructions for ...” Thus, claims 80 and dependent claim 81 are not directed to software only.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

I.

Claims 1-97, 110, 114, 119, 123, 128-129 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Kusterer et al. U.S. Patent Publication No. US2005/0076311A1 (referred to herein as (“*Kusterer*”).

Kusterer relates to “Systems and techniques to provide a unifying navigation model with a navigation service that provides an interface to information sources.” *Kusterer*, Abstract.

Claims 1, 80, 110, and 119 recite “combining a subset of the plurality of user interface elements from the source applications into composite user interface data.” *Kusterer* teaches that “Using the portal platform, a wide range of applications can be displayed in a single page in a browser.” *Kusterer*, ¶0054. However, *Kusterer* does not teach that only “a subset of the plurality of user interface elements from the source applications” and, thus, cannot teach that “combining a subset of the plurality of user interface elements from the source applications into composite user interface data” as required by claims 1, 80, 110, and 119. Accordingly, *Kusterer* does not anticipate claims 1, 80, 110, and 119, or claims dependent thereon.

Regarding claim 17, *Kusterer* does not teach “modelling relationships between the at least part of the user interface provided by the source application **and** the composite user interface” as required by claim 17. *Kusterer* teaches that “According to one aspect, these systems and techniques involve uniting navigation hierarchies from different application sources, and providing a unified navigation area based on the united navigation hierarchy. *Kusterer*, ¶0004. “Uniting the navigation hierarchies can involve accepting connectors for the different application sources, and receiving the navigation information from the different application sources through the connectors according to the navigation object model.” *Id.*, ¶0006. *Kusterer* explains that “A navigation service is supplied with a navigation object model that provides a homogenous view of navigation information from different application sources at 100.” *Id.* ¶0024. “The navigation service can store navigation information in the form of navigation nodes 220, 224 in a data structure representing a united navigation hierarchy.” *Id.*, ¶0030. “A navigation node can include the following properties: Children, Related nodes, Title,

LaunchURL, Visualization, ShowExternal, and Window Size.” *Id.*, ¶0031. Thus, the navigation service and navigation hierarchies are not “modelling relationships between the at least part of the user interface provided by the source application and the composite user interface” as required by claim 17. Accordingly, *Kusterer* does not anticipate claim 17 or claims dependent thereon.

Claim 50 recites “generating model data representing a model of relationships between the at least part of the user interface provided by the source application and the composite user interface.” Accordingly, for at least reasons similar to claim 17, *Kusterer* does not anticipate claim 50 or claims dependent thereon.

Claim 96 recites “generating model data representing a model of said composite user interface.” As discussed with reference to claim 17, the navigation hierarchy and navigation services provide navigation information and are not “model data representing a model of said composite user interface.” As discussed with reference to claim 1, *Kusterer* teaches that “Using the portal platform, a wide range of applications can be displayed in a single page in a browser.” *Kusterer*, ¶0054. However, displaying a wide range of application in a single page in a browser is also clearly not “model data representing a model of said composite user interface.” Accordingly, *Kusterer* does not anticipate claim 96.

As previously discussed, *Kusterer* explains that “A navigation service is supplied with a navigation object model that provides a homogenous view of navigation information from different application sources at 100.” *Id.* ¶0024. “The navigation service can store navigation information in the form of navigation nodes 220, 224 in a data structure representing a united navigation hierarchy.” *Id.*, ¶0030. “A navigation node can include the following properties: Children, Related nodes, Title, LaunchURL, Visualization, ShowExternal, and Window Size.” *Id.*, ¶0031. Thus, *Kusterer* does not anticipate “generating a source application model for each of the at least one source applications [and] generating a composite application model using the source application model” as required by claim 97. Accordingly, *Kusterer* does not anticipate claim 97.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

II.

Claims 98-100, 102-107, 109-111, 114, 118-120, 123, and 127-129 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Gangopadhyay U.S. Patent Publication No. US2002/0184402 (referred to herein as (“*Gangopadhyay*”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 98 and 105 recite “modifying said composite user interface by changing a number of the user interface elements for display by a user computer system in accordance with the usage conditions.” *Gangopadhyay* teaches that “Composite applications combine services from plurality of existing applications and information sources.” *Gangopadhyay*, Abstract. “Via user interface of such a composite application, an end-user wants to access different combinations of existing services in different usage contexts.” *Id.* “The present invention discloses a development method and apparatus to find and combine relevant services automatically for any usage context, so that case-by-case programming for each usage scenario is avoided.” *Id.*, ¶0013. Table 2 of *Gangopadhyay* provides example associations between entry and subordinate services and between and entry and other preceding or subsequent entries in a Personal Workflow. See *Id.* ¶0031 However, *Gangopadhyay* neither teaches nor suggests “modifying said composite user interface by changing a number of the user interface elements for display by a user computer system in accordance with the usage conditions” as required by claims 98 and 105.

Claims 110 and 119 recite “combining a subset of the plurality of user interface elements from the source applications into composite user interface data.” Table 2 of *Gangopadhyay* provides example associations between entry and subordinate services and between and entry and other preceding or subsequent entries in a Personal Workflow. However, the associations in Table 2 do not represent “user interface elements from the source applications.” *Gangopadhyay* does not teach “combining a subset of the plurality of user interface elements from the source applications into composite user interface data” as required by claims 110 and 119. Accordingly, *Gangopadhyay* does not anticipate claims 110, 119, or claims dependent thereon.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

I.

Claims 101 and 108 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gangopadhyay U.S. Patent Publication No. US2002/0184402 (referred to herein as (“*Gangopadhyay*”).

Claims 101 and 108 respectively depend from claims 98 and 105. The rejection of claims 98 and 105 in light of *Gangopadhyay* has already been discussed. Accordingly, claims 101 and 108 are not obvious over *Gangopadhyay* for at least the same reasons as claims 98 and 105, respectively.

II.

Claims 112, 113, 115-117, 121, 122 and 124-126 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kusterer et al. U.S. Patent Publication No. US2005/0076311A1 (referred to herein as (“*Kusterer*”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 112, 113, and 115-117 depend directly or indirectly from claim 110. Claims 121, 122 and 124-126 depend directly or indirectly from claim 119. The rejection of claims 110 and 119 in light of *Kusterer* has already been discussed. Accordingly, claims 112, 113, and 115-117 and claims 121, 122 and 124-126 are not obvious over *Kusterer* for at least the same reasons as claims 110 and 119, respectively.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests that a Notice of Allowance be issued. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at 512-338-9100.

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that on October 18, 2010 this correspondence is being transmitted via the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office's electronic filing system.

/Kent B. Chambers/

Respectfully submitted,

/Kent B. Chambers/

Kent B. Chambers
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 38,839